



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. BOX 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)  
DW Dec-05

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP  
399 PARK AVENUE  
NEW YORK NY 10022

**COPY MAILED**

**DEC 27 2005**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of :  
Vierheilig et al. : DECISION ON PETITIONS  
Application No. 10/790,920 : UNDER 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3)  
Filed: 2 March, 2004 : AND 37 CFR 1.78(a)(6)  
Atty Docket No. 0113222-150 :

This is a decision on the paper filed on 28 November, 2005, which is treated as petitions under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6), to accept an unintentionally delayed claim under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120, and 119(e) for the benefit of the prior-filed applications set forth in the concurrently filed amendment.

The petitions are Granted.

A petition for acceptance of a claim for late priority under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) is only applicable to those applications filed on or after November 29, 2000. Further, the petition is appropriate only after the expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and 1.78(a)(5)(ii). In addition, the petition under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) must be accompanied by:

- (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and 119(e) and 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(i) and 1.78(a)(5)(i) of the prior-filed application, unless previously submitted;
- (2) the surcharge set forth in § 1.17(t); and
- (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and 1.78(a)(5)(ii) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional.

The instant nonprovisional application was filed after November 29, 2000, and the claim herein for the benefit of priority to the prior-filed applications is submitted after expiration of the period specified in 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and 1.78(a)(5)(ii). Therefore, this is a proper petition under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6).

The instant nonprovisional application was pending at the time of filing of the reference to the prior-filed provisional application as required by 37 CFR 1.78(a)(5)(ii). Additionally, intermediate nonprovisional Application No. 09/256,621 was filed within twelve months of the filing date of the prior-filed provisional application, Application No. 60/075,680, which was filed on 24 February, 1998, for which priority is claimed.

The petition complies with the requirements for a grantable petition under 37 CFR §§1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) in that (1) a reference to the above-noted applications has been included in an amendment to the first sentence of the specification following the title and in an Application Data Sheet, as provided by 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(2)(iii) and 1.78(a)(5)(iii); (2) the surcharge fee required by 37 CFR 1.17(t) has been submitted; and (3) the petition contains an adequate statement of unintentional delay. Accordingly, having found that the instant petition for acceptance of an unintentionally delayed claim for the benefit of priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and 119(e) to the above-noted applications satisfies the conditions of 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6), the petition is granted.

37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) require a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and 1.78(a)(5)(ii) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. Since the statement in the petition varies from the required language, the statement will be construed as the statement required by 37 CFR 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6). Petitioner must notify the Office if this is not a correct reading of the statement appearing in the petition.

***The granting of the petition to accept the delayed benefit claim to the prior-filed application(s) under 37 CFR §§ 1.78(a)(3) and 1.78(a)(6) should not be construed as meaning that the instant application is entitled to the benefit of the filing date of the prior-filed application(s). In order for the instant application to be entitled to the benefit of the prior-filed application(s), all other requirements under 35 U.S.C. §120 and 1.78(a)(1) and***

(a) (2) and under 35 U.S.C. §119(e) and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(4) and (a) (5) must be met. Similarly, the fact that the corrected Filing Receipt accompanying this decision on petition includes the prior-filed application(s) should not be construed as meaning that applicant is entitled to the claim for benefit of priority to the prior-filed application(s) noted thereon. Accordingly, the examiner will, in due course, consider this benefit claim and determine whether the instant application is entitled to the benefit of the earlier filing date.

A corrected Filing Receipt, which includes the priority claim to the prior-filed applications, accompanies this decision on petition.

Any questions concerning this matter may be directed to Senior Petitions Attorney Douglas I. Wood at (571) 272-3231. All other inquiries concerning either the examination procedures or status of the application should be directed to the Technology Center.

This application is being forwarded to Technology Center Art Unit 1754 for appropriate action on the amendment submitted 28 November, 2005, including consideration by the examiner of the claim for the benefit of priority to the prior-filed applications.

  
Frances Hicks  
Lead Paralegal  
Office of Petitions  
Office of the Deputy Commissioner  
for Patent Examination Policy

Attachment: Corrected Filing Receipt